

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 01

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Torres Strait Finfish Fishery Reallocation

**Hansard Page:** 116 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Abetz asked:**

**Senator ABETZ**—Can I go back to the northern waters. Take this on notice, please. Have the hours of the coastal surveillance flights been maintained? If you could give me the month-by-month figure for the actual hours flown, that would be very helpful.

**Answer:**

Border Protection Command has provided the following information:

- a) The hours of coastal surveillance flights have been maintained.
- b) Border Protection Command is not prepared to release publicly monthly details of flying operations.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 02

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Torres Strait Finfish Fishery Reallocation

**Hansard Page:** 118 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Abetz asked:**

**Senator ABETZ**—The government tried to announce this as an election commitment that had already been delivered just a few days or weeks after having been elected to office. Can you confirm to me that, before the change of government, over 90 per cent—I think there were only two fin fishing licences outstanding that had not signed up to the previous government's offer of a buyout.

**Mr A Grant**—I do not have the exact timing of when the final negotiations were done with all fishers but certainly they were started in the time of the previous government and were completed in the time of the current government.

**Senator ABETZ**—Can I ask you to take on notice when the last fin fishing licence was signed up for the total buyout.

**Answer:**

The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry received the last signed agreement on 14 December 2007 (it was signed on 10/12/2007 by operator). The department signed all agreements on 14 December 2007.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 03

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Torres Strait Finfish Fishery Reallocation

**Hansard Page:** 119 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Abetz asked:**

**Senator ABETZ**—Can you indicate, without identifying who, how many of those signed up on what particular dates in the months of November and December and what dates of those months? Are you with me on that?

**Mr A Grant**—I understand, but I will have to take that on notice.

**Answer:**

The table below shows the date that each agreement was signed by the operator and witnessed. It should be noted that the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry signed these agreements on 14 December 2007 at which point they were binding.

Table 1. Witness dates of Finfish Buyout Agreements by date of operator signature

Date Signed	Number
12/11/2007	5
13/11/2007	2
14/11/2007	2
15/11/2007	1
18/11/2007	5
19/11/2007	3
20/11/2007	3
21/11/2007	1
22/11/2007	1
23/11/2007	1
6/12/2007	1
10/12/2007	1
	26

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 04

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Torres Strait Finfish Fishery Reallocation

**Hansard Page:** 120 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Abetz asked:**

**Dr O'Connell**—I think what Mr Grant is saying is that that money was not all in the contingency reserve.

**Senator ABETZ**—We know that. We have already got that well and truly established, but the money was made available. The total amount in the contingency and that which was allocated by the Prime Minister's Office allowed for the full buyout.

**Dr O'Connell**—We would have to take on notice what was the nature of the approval from the Prime Minister, but I think what Mr Grant is suggesting is that we did not have that money allocated within the department.

**Answer:**

The Prime Minister approved a total of \$7.896 million, \$5.196 million was held in the Department of Finance and Administration's contingency reserve and \$2.7 million was reallocated from the unused portion of the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry's Onshore Business Assistance fund.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 05

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic: Promoting Australian Produce Program**

**Hansard Page:** 122-123 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Abetz asked:**

**Mr A Grant**—Yes, I can, Senator. There was a commitment to provide, as you said, \$5 million to promote the seafood sector. That election commitment is being implemented by the department. Formal responsibility for that sits with our food and agriculture area, but the department is proceeding with it.

**Senator ABETZ**—Because the \$5 million is now going to be used, as I understand it, not only for the promotion of seafood but for a whole host of others, and will be shared throughout the agriculture portfolio. Is that correct?

**Mr A Grant**—I am not aware of the specific details. But we will be implementing the election commitment, as it was set out during the election.

**Senator ABETZ**—You see, everybody interpreted the promise as being \$5 million for the seafood sector. It now appears that it is \$5 million—

**Dr O'Connell**—Senator, Mr A Grant did not agree that the money is spread around. What he did say was that it is operated by a different part of the department that has already been through this Senate estimates. I am quite happy to take it on notice and provide you with the information.

**Senator ABETZ**—That would be very kind. Thank you.

**Answer:**

The election commitment from the government stated that it will invest \$5 million to create a '*Promoting Australian Produce*' initiative to assist Australian producers to develop and implement initiatives that raise awareness of the premium quality of Australian produce, including home grown fruit and vegetables, pork and seafood products.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 06

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry Division

**Topic:** Indian Ocean Tuna Commission summary

**Hansard Page:** 125 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Ian Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD**—I wonder, without imposing on you enormously, if you would not mind providing to the committee a two-page summary of the difficulties and where you are going, and Australia's position and where we want to head. Would that be asking too much?

**Dr Kalish**—In relation to the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission?

**Senator IAN MACDONALD**—Yes.

**Dr Kalish**—I think we can do that.

**Answer:**

Australia engages in the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) as a responsible fishing nation and in order to meet our international obligations to manage highly migratory fish stocks, protect the marine environment and to ensure continued access for the Australian fisheries industry. Although Australia's fishing interests in the region are currently small, we maintain a significant influence in order to protect our exclusive economic zone (EEZ), which is the largest in the Indian Ocean, and ensure future access to resources. Further, Australia's participation in the IOTC provides a mechanism for regional engagement with Indian Ocean coastal states.

The IOTC's diverse geographic, social, political and economic membership is a major obstacle in implementing conservation and management measures and establishing effective compliance arrangements. Distant water fishing nations (DWFNs) and economic integrated organisations seek to maintain large fleets that control the majority of industrial fishing interests in the Indian Ocean. Developing coastal and island states exploit the fisheries for subsistence and as a major source of income. Larger coastal states such as Australia, South Africa and India have little history in the fishery, however, are looking to expand their fisheries as coastal states of the Indian Ocean.

The Indian Ocean is unique among tuna fisheries due to the very large percentage of artisanal catch by Indian Ocean developing coastal states that do not have resources or infrastructure to monitor the activities of their fishers. The IOTC is actively assisting developing coastal states in collecting and providing adequate fisheries data to the IOTC. However, this needs to be backed up by capacity building and development of a cooperative approach among both developed fishing nations and developing coastal states of the Indian Ocean.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

Taiwanese-flagged vessels represent a substantial portion of unregulated fishing activity in the Indian Ocean. However, the Fishing Entity of Chinese Taipei is unable to participate in this forum despite being a significant fisher in the Indian Ocean. Chinese Taipei is not recognised under United Nations framework and the IOTC was established under the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). For Taiwan to be outside the regulatory framework is detrimental to the effective conservation and management of the resources of the region.

The four other tuna regional fishery management organisations operate outside the FAO framework and have accommodated Taiwan's involvement in various. Separating the IOTC from the FAO was considered the best solution to include Taiwan. Furthermore, IOTC Members agreed that there would be gains in efficiency and effectiveness of the IOTC if it became independent of the FAO.

After several years of negotiation, draft amendments to the IOTC Agreement were agreed at the tenth annual session of the IOTC in May, 2006. The Director-General of the FAO sought further advice from the FAO governing bodies on the proposed amendments before providing them to the IOTC Members for the consideration for adoption. The amendments were not adopted at the IOTC's 2007 session with a number of developing states speaking out against adoption and there was an agreement to seek further guidance from the FAO. In an effort to ensure that the matter was progressed, IOTC Members agreed to invite the FAO to take immediate action on the draft amendments in preparation for their further consideration at its 12th Session.

The FAO Council identified 'solutions' to making the Commission more effective and efficient, which involve it remaining within the FAO, but making administrative improvements or establishing a separate process to negotiate a new agreement. The first solution will not solve the problem of the exclusion of Taiwan and negotiating a new agreement would take many years and further jeopardise tuna stocks.

The tuna and billfish stocks in the Indian Ocean are still considered to be in a reasonably healthy state. However, the IOTC Scientific Committee has advised for several years that fishing effort must be reduced to ensure long-term sustainability.

Although the tuna and billfish stocks of the Indian Ocean are as yet not overfished, if catches are not reduced or at least maintained at current levels, stocks will decline to unsustainable levels.

In recent years, the IOTC has begun making progress on conservation and management of the tuna and billfish resources of the Indian Ocean. Progress has been made on measures to limit the capacity of the large-scale fishing fleets and to address the impact on non-target species, particularly sharks, seabirds and turtles.

The IOTC members have agreed to limit fishing capacity of their large scale fishing vessels, however, this limit only applies to members with high catch levels (above 1000 tonnes). Coastal states, particularly small island developing states, are able to

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

increase fishing capacity but must report the intended increase to the IOTC through a fleet development plan.

This measure will not be effective at limiting capacity in real terms, but it does reflect a change in the mind-set of member nations and recognition that the fishery has reached a point where further increases in fishing will be detrimental to stocks. Australia will seek to ensure that limits on fishing capacity effectively limit catch and that any increase in coastal state fisheries is reflected in reductions elsewhere in the fishery. In addition, we will seek to distinguish increases in fishing capacity of coastal states that are of limited benefit to the coastal state and represent 'flag hopping' by DWFNs. Australia has provided funds for a study on fishing capacity in the Indian Ocean and will take a lead role in ensuring the scope and nature of the study addresses relevant questions to allow members to adopt appropriate measures.

Australia, as a leader in ecosystem based fisheries management, will work with IOTC members to adopt amendments to strengthen current bycatch management and conservation measures. Current measures adopted by the IOTC need greater clarity and certainty in their interpretation and application.

The IOTC has not performed strongly in terms of monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) arrangements. Many coastal states in the region do not have the regulatory framework, nor do they have the capacity to control their vessels or the vessels of DWFNs fishing in their waters, let alone on the adjacent high seas. Australia implements a high standard of MCS for its tuna and billfish fisheries and is working to achieve this standard for all members of the IOTC.

The IOTC is the first tuna RFMO to undertake an internal performance review focusing on the effectiveness of the Commission to fulfil its mandate. The review is based on the recommendation of the joint tuna RFMO meeting held in Kobe, Japan on 28 January 2007. Australia participated in the first meeting of the review panel in Seychelles, 25-29 February 2008 and will ensure that the review outcome is a frank and objective evaluation of the performance of the IOTC.



**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 07

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Ministerial Obligations- Disbursement of Grant Moneys

**Hansard Page:** 125-126 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Milne asked:**

**Senator MILNE**—Did the department inform the minister of his obligations under the financial management regulations in relation to the disbursement of the grants moneys?

**Dr O'Connell**—I would have to take that on notice.

**Senator MILNE**—It is a pretty important question.

**Dr O'Connell**—It is, and because you want a specific answer, we will have to take it on notice.

**Senator MILNE**—I would like to know when the department informed the minister of his obligations in relation to that.

**Answer:**

As at 19 February 2008, the department had not made any recommendations to Minister Burke with respect to the Tasmanian Community Forest Agreement Industry Development Grant programs and therefore did not advise the Minister of his obligations under the financial management regulations in relation to the disbursement of the grants moneys.

The department has subsequently made grant recommendations to Minister Burke and has advised the Minister of his obligations under the financial management regulations in relation to the disbursement of the grants moneys.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 08

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** TCFA Industry Development Program

**Hansard Page:** 126 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Milne asked:**

**Senator MILNE**—According to your report, up until June 2007, 40 grants totalling \$33.8 million were approved and 12 grant recipients were identified for research funding. Between June 2007 and 24 November 2007, how many grant applications were approved or recommended?

**Mr A Grant**—I would have to check the exact number, but my understanding is that 88 grants have been approved by ministers up till that period of time.

**Senator ABETZ**—Not an extra 88?

**Mr A Grant**—No, 88 in total.

**Senator MILNE**—So there were 40 between the commencement of the program in May 2005 to June 2007 and another 40 between June 2007—

**Mr A Grant**—Another 48. It may be 88 or 89, I am not quite sure, but it is around 48.

**Senator MILNE**—Would you be able to provide the committee with details of those grants—who got them, what sum and whether the department recommended that they be approved—please.

**Mr A Grant**—Yes, I can take that on notice.

**Senator MILNE**—Thank you.

**Mr A Grant**—Can I clarify that not all of those grants will have been paid in full. In fact, some of them may not have been paid at all, because once the approval process is made with these grants, negotiation has to take place with the successful applicant about the signing of a deed of funding and in some cases some of the applicants have taken a significant amount of time to sign and negotiate that deed of funding. So you should not assume that all of those grants have been paid.

**Senator MILNE**—I am interested in knowing which ones were recommended and/or approved between June and 24 November last year. Whether they eventually get paid is another question.

**Answer:**

26 grant applications were approved between June and 24 November 2007.

See details in tables below.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Tasmanian Forest Industry Development Program**

<b>No</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Project Details</b>	<b>Total Project Costs</b>	<b>Ministerial approval date</b>	<b>Grant amount approved</b>	<b>Department recommendation</b>
5	Aprin Logging	Traditional harvesting re-tooling through the purchase of 3 items of new equipment to process smaller diameter re-growth timbers- a feller buncher, a grapple skidder and a harvester with a processing head.	\$2,055,000	28/09/07	\$513,750	To be approved
12	G & W Harvesting P/L	Purchase & installation of SATCO harvesting/processing head & boom fitted to a Komatsu base, drying kiln, electric sawmill & chipper.	\$1,591,500	02/07/07	\$397,875	To be approved
29	P.L. & T.J. Page P/L <b>WITHDRAWN ON 8/8/07</b>	Purchase of a purpose built harvesting machine suitable for a mix of timber species.	\$847,000	02/07/07	\$211,750 approved, but company then withdrew on 8/8/07.	To be approved
51	ITC (Neville Smith)	Transport of secondhand Head Rig from Murrindindi (ITC) to Southwood. (including refurbishment of head rig, extension to building electrical upgrade and steel works).	\$642,500	28/09/07	\$160,625	To be approved
52	ITC (Neville Smith)	Drymill optimising docker at Mowbray mill (docking machine, dust extraction, sorting table, and associated equipment).	\$290,327	28/09/07	\$72,582	To be approved
54	ITC (Neville Smith)	Replacement of boiler at the company's Mowbray mill.	\$2,031,500	28/09/07	\$507,875	To be approved

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

75	Riella Pty Ltd	Purchase of 2 items of mechanical harvesting equipment- an excavator and a skidder.	\$645,600	28/09/07	\$161,000	To be approved
77	Wilson Logging Pty Ltd	Purchase of 4 items of mechanical harvesting equipment for harvesting small-diameter regrowth logs- 3 excavators and the fitting of 2 cut off saws.	\$844,000	10/08/07	\$236,954	To be approved
79	Wildcat Contracting Pty Ltd	Purchase of a Cat 320C excavator with Komatsu K-saw.	\$155,000	02/07/07	\$38,750	To be approved
88	Fielding Logging Pty Ltd	Purchase of 2 items of mechanical harvesting equipment to assist in the move from native forests to plantations- an excavator and a harvesting head.	\$650,000	02/07/07	\$162,500	To be approved
90	Andrew Lette Pty Ltd	Purchase of 7 items mechanical harvesting equipment, including 3 excavators, a purpose built feller buncher and a disc saw.	\$2,890,000	28/09/07	\$722,500	To be approved
95	M C Cartage Enterprises Pty Ltd	Purchase of two Caterpillar 322B excavators.	\$235,000	10/08/07	\$50,000	To be approved
101	Casegrande Lumber P/L	Purchase of 8 items mechanical harvesting equipment- 4 harvesters, 1 harvesting head, 2 forwarders, and 1 feller buncher.	\$4,047,238	10/08/07	\$861,864	To be approved
102	Southcape Harvesters Pty Ltd	Purchase of mechanical harvesting equipment, including 2 excavators.	\$812,965	02/07/07	\$203,241	To be approved
104	Eastern Tiers Logging Pty Ltd	Purchase of mechanical harvesting equipment, including excavators and a grapple skidder.	\$1,830,555	02/07/07	\$315,963	To be approved
105	Eastern Tiers Logging Pty Ltd	Purchase of mechanical harvesting equipment, including a feller buncher and base processor.	\$1,380,000	02/07/07	\$345,000	To be approved

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

106	Allen Brittain Pty Ltd	Purchase of an excavator with a felling head and a skidder.	\$419,000	28/09/07	\$104,750	To be approved
111	Andrew Lette Pty Ltd	Purchase of two skidders and an excavator for use in plantations.	\$695,018	28/09/07	\$173,755	To be approved
114	Paper Australia Pty Ltd	Upgrade the receiving facility at the Burnie paper mill to enable the company to accept pulp from Maryvale instead of from overseas.	\$2,850,000	28/09/07	\$522,500	To be approved
115	Paper Australia Pty Ltd	Installation of new winding equipment to enable the production of wider diameter reels at the Wesley Vale mill.	\$1,257,000	28/09/07	\$314,250	To be approved

**Tasmanian Country Sawmills Assistance Program**

No	Applicant	Project Details	Total Project Costs	Ministerial approval date	Grant amount approved	Department recommendation
14	Smart Timber Solutions Pty Ltd	Upgrade sawmill to assist processing of lower grade logs and plantation logs.	\$830,000	02-Jul-07	\$284,015	To be approved
30	Mathews Timber Pty Ltd	Purchase of new drying and sawing equipment to enable the company to move from large old growth logs to smaller logs.	\$393,000	02-Jul-07	\$196,500	To be approved

**Tasmanian Softwood Industry Development Program**

No	Applicant	Project Details	Total Project Costs	Ministerial approval date	Grant amount approved	Department recommendation
18	K.J. & B. Mahnken Pty Ltd	Purchase of 15 items of mechanical harvesting equipment for use in softwood plantations, including 6 excavators, 4 harvesting heads and 2 skidders.	\$4,602,060	10/08/07	\$1,150,516	To be approved

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

21	Auspine	Contribution to offset increased harvesting cost of up to 200,000 cubic metres of sawlogs from Strahan.	\$7,866,000	10/08/07	\$450,000	To be approved
25	Wright's Harvesting Pty Ltd	Purchase of mechanical harvesting equipment, including a Hitachi ZX225 high- wide excavator .	\$297,607	19/09/07	\$74,401	To be approved
23(a)	Statewide Forest Services	Purchase of a Komatsu PC228 excavator.	\$273,250	28/09/07	\$68,312	To be approved

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 09

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** TCFA Industry Development Program

**Hansard Page:** 126 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Milne asked:**

**Senator MILNE**—As at 1 October last year, how much of the grants money that had been put forward had actually been allocated? How much was left over at 1 October last year in those three programs?

**Mr A Grant**—I will have to take that on notice. I cannot tell you the exact number at 1 October.

**Answer:**

As at 1 October 2007, \$42,278,319 had been approved by Ministers under the Tasmanian Community Forest Agreement Industry Development Grant programs. One application for \$211,750 was approved but the company subsequently withdrew their application. As at 1 October 2007, unallocated grant money was \$13,933,431.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 10

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Letter from Minister relating to grant money

**Hansard Page:** 126 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Milne asked:**

**Senator MILNE**—Thank you. Can you indicate whether the minister sent a letter to anybody, or a number of people, in the forest industry asking them to apply for the grant money before the election?

**Mr A Grant**—The minister at that time?

**Senator MILNE**—Was Senator Abetz.

**Mr A Grant**—I would have to take that on notice. I am not aware that a letter was sent, but I will take that on notice.

**Senator MILNE**—Can I ask not only whether a letter was sent but that you table a copy of the letter and a list of the people to whom it was sent.

**Mr A Grant**—Presuming there was a letter.

**Senator MILNE**—If there was a letter.

**Mr A Grant**—Okay

**Answer:**

No letter was sent by the former Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation asking the forest industry to apply for grant money before the election.



**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 11

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** TCFA IDP- Buffalo Valley Logging and CK Forest Management grants

**Hansard Page:** 127 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Milne asked:**

**Senator MILNE**—Thank you. I would like the list of the people to whom it was sent, and we will see if that correlates with the people who got the grants. In relation to the particular grants, considerable sums of money were paid to Buffalo Valley Logging and CK Forest Management. Can you tell me about those grants, please, and where Buffalo Logging has its operational headquarters.

**Mr A Grant**—I might defer to Mr Bartlett, who is a bit closer to the grants program than me. He may know that.

**Mr Bartlett**—Buffalo Valley Logging Co. has operations in Tasmania. They also have operations in Victoria. In relation to the grant that they applied for under this program, it was for machinery and operations that were based in north-eastern Tasmania. I would have to look up the application to give you the exact location. I do not have that detail with me.

**Answer:**

Details of grants approved for Buffalo Valley Logging and CK Forest Management:-

**Tasmanian Forest Industry Development Program**

No	Applicant	Project Details	Grant amount approved
33	Buffalo Valley Logging Pty Ltd	Purchase of hardwood thinning equipment, including feller buncher, processor, forwarder & excavator.	\$307,250.00
34	CK Forest Management Pty Ltd	Purchase of mechanised logging equipment for old growth/regrowth operation, including falling head & guarding package & cut-off saw.	\$91,625.00
35	Buffalo Valley Logging Pty Ltd	Purchase of native regrowth thinning equipment, including feller buncher, processors & forwarder.	\$657,000.00

Buffalo Valley Logging has advised that its operational headquarters is in Launceston, Tasmania.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 12

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** TCFA IDP- Buffalo Valley Logging and CK Forest Management

**Hansard Page:** 127 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Milne asked:**

**Senator MILNE**—What is the relationship between Buffalo Valley Logging and CK Forest Management?

**Mr Bartlett**—I will have to take that question on notice. That was an issue that we looked at at the time, because those two companies have some common shareholders, but I cannot recall the exact details.

**Answer:**

Buffalo Valley Logging and C K Forest Management (CKFM) are two separate companies, with Kenneth Padgett and Colin McCulloch as the directors of both companies.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 13

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** TCFA Industry Development Program grant

**Hansard Page:** 127 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Milne asked:**

**Senator MILNE**—Would you provide the committee with the business case analysis that was the basis for that grant being paid.

**Mr A Grant**—It may be commercial-in-confidence. If we can provide that, we will, but we may not be able to. I will have to check that.

**Senator MILNE**—That may be the case, but it is also the case that this is public money and there is an expectation that there will be an adequate analysis of the business case behind the grant, and it seems extraordinary that they should have gone into liquidation so quickly. In fact, it would be good to know the date of the business case analysis, the date of going into liquidation and the date of the grant being paid.

**Answer:**

The business case analysis undertaken for AW Harvesting is attached.

The Independent Assessor's analysis of the proposal was completed on 11 April 2006, and Ministers approved the application on 24 May 2006.

The one and only grant payment of \$125,960 (ex GST) was paid on 2 June 2006. All purchases were made during June and July 2005.

According to the Australian Securities and Investments Commission website (<http://www.search.asic.gov.au/cgi-bin/gns030c>) AW Harvesting Pty Ltd submitted a 'Notification of Appointment of an External Administrator' on 18 September 2006.

**[FF 13 attachment]**

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 14

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** TCFA IDP- Analysis of Grant Applications

**Hansard Page:** 127 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Milne asked:**

**Senator MILNE**—What analysis was made, in looking at these grant applications, between adjustment to a changed resource and business as usual plant and equipment? For example, can you explain to me why money was made available to Britton Bros for a new forklift?

**Mr Bartlett**—I would have to check that. I do not believe we have provided any money to any applicant for forklifts. When those applications have come before the advisory committee that oversees this, that is one of the items that we have taken out. The information you have might be from the original application, not all of which might be funded. I can double-check, but I am not aware of any instance where we have paid money for a forklift.

**Senator MILNE**—Would you mind checking to see if that is the case.

**Mr Bartlett**—Certainly.

**Answer:**

A number of eligibility criteria and priorities for funding were used to assess all the applications for funding under the three programs. These included:

- innovation and provision for significant upgrading of processing, harvesting or haulage technology;
- introduce or investigate new but proven technologies to the Tasmanian forest industries
- assist with adjustment to the changing nature of supply, particularly regrowth and plantation-grown logs
- increase the processing and value-adding of small regrowth, plantation and residual logs;
- make the harvesting and transporting of timber and forest products safer, more efficient and more competitive, in ways that are sustainable and environmentally sound;
- promote and contribute to a viable long-term future for the Tasmanian forest industries.

For each application, the Advisory Committee assessed how the whole proposal met the eligibility criteria and priorities and whether individual components were consistent with program priorities. Applications for funding for forklifts or new haulage trucks were not considered to be a priority.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

The forklift that Britton Brothers Pty Ltd originally applied for was not recommended for funding by the Advisory Committee and not funded in the grant paid to the company.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 15

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** TCFA IDP- Audit Reports

**Hansard Page:** 128 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Milne asked:**

**Senator MILNE**—I am very interested in these particular grant applications for a range of things that, in my view, do not constitute adjustment to the particular programs. In relation to the audits, how many of the people who have actually got the grants have provided audit reports and how many have provided them on time?

**Mr A. Grant**—We will have to take that on notice, Senator, but it is fair to say that we have not received 100 per cent compliance with people providing audited statements throughout the process, and it is an area that we do need to follow up in improving the program.

**Senator MILNE**—I do not understand why you cannot tell me that, because it is on the public record that 17 should have provided audit reports by now and only three have done so on time. Seven have not provided any at all, four were due in 2006 and a further seven were late. That is what is on the public record, so I am asking you to tell me what you are doing about compliance with those audits.

**Mr A. Grant**—We are proposing to write to applicants to remind them of their obligations under the funding deeds to provide audited statements.

**Senator MILNE**—When did you decide to write to them about that?

**Mr A. Grant**—It has been in consideration for a little while now. I cannot remember the exact date that we made a decision to do that.

**Senator MILNE**—And the letter has not yet been written?

**Mr A. Grant**—I do not think so. Mr Bartlett?

**Mr Bartlett**—We have got a letter that is about ready to go out. It is written.

**Senator MILNE**—Could you provide me at this time specifically the level of compliance with regard to these particular grants?

**Mr A. Grant**—It is the compliance with the need to provide an audited statement?

**Senator MILNE**—Yes—the compliance with the need to provide an audit report on these particular grants. A copy of the letter would be useful as well.

**Answer:**

As at 19 February 2008, 43 projects had been completed. Out of those projects, 38 reports were required to have been submitted. As at 19 February 2008, 18 reports had been received, of which 7 were submitted on time and 11 were late.

As at 19 February 2008, a compliance level of 47% of reports due, have been submitted and 18% of due reports had been received on time.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

The text of the letter is below:-

----

18 February 2008

Name  
Company  
Address  
State Postcode

Dear Name

I am writing to advise you of the Australian Government's approval for a 30 per cent additional payment to be made to all approved recipients of Tasmanian Community Forest Agreement Industry Development Program (TCFAIDP) grants.

Your company, NAME, was awarded a grant of \$AMOUNT 1 under the NAME Assistance Programme of the TCFA (project number). Your company is now entitled to claim up to an additional \$AMOUNT 2 (30 per cent ex GST). If you have not yet claimed the full amount of your approved grant, you will be reimbursed initially on a *pro rata* basis. Subsequent grant payments will be eligible for the additional 30 per cent payment.

In claiming the additional funds the following procedures will apply:

- Please supply an **original** tax invoice clearly identifying the payment requested as '30 per cent Additional Payment'. Ensure you identify the Project number.
- When claiming both a milestone payment AND the '30 per cent Additional Payment', please submit separate original invoices at the same time.

**Fully expended grant**

- Where a Project has been fully expended in accordance with the Deed of Agreement (ie. 100 per cent of entitlement), you may claim the entire 30 per cent additional payment. Payment in such cases will be conditional upon the Commonwealth having received a final audit and grant report as required by the Deed.

**Project completed, grant funds remaining**

- Where a Project is complete and claims against the grant are **less** than the agreed amount as per 'Schedule 1 of the Deed of Agreement', a 30 per cent pro rata payment will be made based on the actual grant payment/s. Payment in such cases will be conditional upon the Commonwealth receiving a final audit and grant report as required by the Deed.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Project incomplete, grant funds remaining**

- Where a Project has been partially expended and likely to require future payments to be made, you may request a 30 per cent pro rata payment of the grant paid to that point.
- Future requests for milestone payments will also be eligible for the '30 per cent Additional Payment'. Please submit a separate original invoice at the same time as the milestone invoice. Payment in such cases will be conditional upon the Commonwealth having received a grant milestone report as outlined in the deed of Agreement.

Please be aware in receiving your grant, you may have obligations under the *Income Tax Assessment Act 1997*. Please seek professional advice or that of the Australian Tax Office to ensure you understand your responsibilities regarding your grant and these additional funds.

In August 2007 the Australian Government announced the TCFA IDP completion date was to be extended by 12 months to June 2009. No industry grant payments will be able to be made beyond this date. This extension should not be viewed as an opportunity to prolong investment in those items forming the basis of the grant, nor in making the associated claims. Every effort should continue to be made to claim funds by 30 June 2008.

The provision of these additional funds does not alter the existing milestone requirements under your Deed of Agreement and it is our expectation these will continue to be met unless we mutually agree to vary the milestone dates. Where milestones have fallen behind those stipulated in the original Deed of Agreement, it will be necessary to advise the TFIDP Secretariat of the variations, providing a reason for the variation and an indication of the revised milestone schedule. Failure to meet the obligation of advising the TFIDP Secretariat of changes to milestones may result in having to renegotiate your Deed of Agreement.

If you have a good reason for needing to move any milestone into the 2008-09 financial year, you will need to make such a request in writing to the TCFAIDP Secretariat, clearly indicating the proposed variation to the milestone schedule and the reason for these variations.

Should you have any questions relating to the additional funds or procedures outlined in this letter, please contact me on PHONE NUMBER or EMAIL@daff.gov.au

Yours sincerely

NAME  
Secretariat  
TCFA Industry Development Program  
Forest Industries Branch



**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 16

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Regional Forest Agreement

**Hansard Page:** 129 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Bob Brown asked:**

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Did you or people in your department investigate the current logging in the Styx River Valley with a view to seeing if it were in accordance with the regional forest agreement?

**Mr A. Grant**—We did not particularly go to Tasmania to investigate that—no.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Did anybody, that you know of, do that?

**Mr A. Grant**—It may have been looked at by the environment department.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—No. It says here the department of the minister, the Hon. Tony Burke MP.

**Mr A. Grant**—Senator, could you just read out the actual text in the letter.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Yes, sure.

The minister with responsibility for regional forest agreements is the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, the

Hon. Tony Burke MP. I am advised—

that is, David Epstein, the chief of staff for the office of the Prime Minister, and this letter is dated 11 January

this year—

that investigations by his department indicate that current logging in the Styx River Valley is in accordance with the

regional forest agreement.

Who undertook that investigation?

**Dr O'Connell**—We will have to take that on notice, Senator. It is clear that we do not have that information, and I will take it on notice to be sure we get the right answer.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—But this is the Prime Minister's office advising me that you have undertaken an investigation, and you do not know about it?

**Dr O'Connell**—I am saying I will take it—

**Senator McLucas**—We will take that question on notice, Senator Brown.

**Answer:**

Under the Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement (RFA), forest management, including harvesting operations, is the responsibility of the Tasmanian Government.

Officers from the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry have held discussions with the Forest Practices Authority regarding forestry operations in the Styx Valley. These discussions confirmed that the all proposed operations were to be carried out in accordance with a certified Forest Practices Plan, as per the requirements of the RFA.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 17

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Employment in Forest Industry

**Hansard Page:** 131-132 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Bob Brown asked:**

**Senator BOB BROWN**—And how many are involved in the woodchip industry per se, Mr Bartlett?

**Mr Bartlett**—I do not think data that specific is available from ABS.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—But that is the majority of the export logging operations from Australia. You do not have figures on that?

**Mr Bartlett**—We do not collect them—no.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Does anybody that you know of?

**Mr Bartlett**—No, not to my knowledge; not to that specific level of detail. As I said, the categories that ABS collect are processing industries and broader forest industry.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—How many of those jobs are in Tasmania?

**Mr Bartlett**—I would have to take that on notice, but that would be broken down state by state.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—How many of those are in the direct logging industry itself, including processing, within Australia?

**Dr O'Connell**—I might suggest, for the efficiency for the committee, that we clearly do not have a breakdown of these numbers here. It may be more productive if you are able to provide the questions to us-

**Senator BOB BROWN**—You have heard the questions so I will ask you to provide the answers, if you would, Mr O'Connell.

**Dr O'Connell**—That is fine.

**Answer:**

- A. The number of jobs in the woodchip manufacturing industry in Australia was 1,379 in 2005-06 (the most recent year for which comprehensive statistics are available).
- B. No figure is available at a state level for the woodchip manufacturing industry.
- C. The number of jobs in the forestry, logging and wood manufacturing industry (including the paper processing industry) within Australia in 2006-07 were estimated at 83,400 (ABARE, Australian Forest and Wood Products Statistics report December 2007).

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 18

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Ministerial Visit to Tasmania

**Hansard Page:** 132 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Bob Brown asked:**

**Senator BOB BROWN**—I have got just a couple more questions. Firstly, the minister visited Tasmania at the end of last year in his capacity as minister for forests. Who did he meet there and what was the purpose of that visit?

**Mr Quinlivan**—The purpose of the visit was to familiarise himself with the forest industry in Tasmania and he met with a range of people from the industry and the Tasmanian government—quite a number. As to the precise people, I think we would have to take that on notice.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Would you, please.

**Mr Quinlivan**—And ask the minister about the full range of people that he met with.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Did he meet with members of the tourism industry or the environment community who are very much involved with forestry in Tasmania?

**Mr Quinlivan**—I am not aware of that. We would have to check with him on that.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Would you and let me know about that.

**Answer:**

A. The Minister met with a range of stakeholders from across his portfolio interests. In his capacity as Minister for forests he met with the following:

Bob GORDON	Forestry Tasmania	Managing Director
Hans DRIELSMA	Forestry Tasmania	Executive General Manager
Mike FARROW	Forestry Tasmania	District Forest Manager, Huon
Barry LOWE	ITC Ltd (Sawmill)	Manager
Simon KANG	Ta Ann timber mill	Director
Peter PEPPER	Forestry Tasmania	Community Liaison Officer
Robert ARMSTRONG	Huon Valley Council	Mayor
Laurie DILLON	Huon Valley Council	Deputy Mayor
Alan DUGGAN	Huon Resources Group	
Barry CHIPMAN	Timber Communities Australia	State Co-ordinator
Dr How SING SII	Ta Ann timber mill	
David RIDLEY	Ta Ann timber mill	
Martin CLIFFORD	Construction Forestry Mining Energy Union	
The Hon. Paul LENNON MP	Government of Tasmania	Premier

B. No.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 19

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the logging industry

**Hansard Page:** 133-134 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Bob Brown asked:**

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Would you do an inventory of that and see if there have been any officers involved, and if there have been outputs from the department over the last 12 years, and report back to the committee on that.

**Mr Quinlivan**—Any output in the area of greenhouse gas accounting for forest operations?

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Yes.

**Mr Quinlivan**—That is your specific question?

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Yes.

**Senator MILNE**—And also for standing forests.

**CHAIR**—Senator Brown if you do have—

**Mr A. Grant**—It is a bit—

**CHAIR**—We have 15 minutes, if you can come straight to the point.

**Mr A. Grant**—No—I am not sure I understand what we are being asked to do.

**Dr O’Connell**—That sounds like an extremely large project and I would want to assess the resources that would be used for it, because over a 12-year period is a long time.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD**—This is the estimates for 2007-08. Just very quickly, because there is not much time left for me.

**Senator McLucas**—I would like to clarify this so we finish it off. Senator Brown, I wonder if you could rethink that request?

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Yes—I will put the question off or narrow it right down.

**Senator McLucas**—Because it is a very large piece of work.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—Could the department furnish the committee with any information about any output it has had at all in the assessment of greenhouse gas emissions from the logging industry in Australia?

**CHAIR**—Senator Brown, I think the department and the parliamentary secretary have guaranteed that they will come back to you and take it on notice.

**Senator McLucas**—I really do want to clarify what that question is, Senator Brown.

**Dr O’Connell**—Is there a time limit? That would be helpful.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—I said for the previous 12 months.

**Senator McLucas**—I am sorry. I thought you said 12 years.

**Senator BOB BROWN**—No, I did not. I changed it to 12 months.

**CHAIR**—Madam Parliamentary Secretary, are you comfortable with that?

**Senator McLucas**—Thank you, we are happy to take that question on notice.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Answer:**

The only outputs on this topic were produced by the Bureau of Rural Science (BRS). BRS uses information provided in publications from the Australian Greenhouse Office (now in the Department of Climate Change) and state agency reports to inform Bureau outputs on matters associated with forest carbon and climate change.

Examples of source material include:

- AGO (2007) National Inventory Report 2005. Volume 1. Australian Greenhouse Office, Canberra. [Available from AGO/Department of Climate Change website] (the latest available national data).
- MBAC (2007) Forestry Tasmania's Carbon Sequestration Position. Forestry Tasmania, December 2nd, 2007. Refer especially to pages 19 and 20 and Table 14 for 2006 estimated data on commercial forest harvesting. [Available from Forestry Tasmania website]

In 2007 the Bureau released *Forests at a Glance 2007* which was an update of earlier *Forests at a Glance* publications. The page on carbon (p22) in the 2007 edition did not include any new information since that reported in the State of the Forests Report (SOFR) 2003 as the AGO information for 2005 was not available to the Bureau prior to the publication of *Forests at a Glance 2007*.

Updated forest and carbon figures will appear in the BRS publications *Changing Face of Australia's Forests 2008*; (released in March) and *State of the Forests Report 2008*; (released in March).

The following are extracts of what is in SOFR 2008.

**Key points:**

- A net amount of greenhouse gases equivalent to 43.5 million tonnes of carbon dioxide was estimated to be sequestered in managed native forests in 2005.
- The removal of carbon from native forests by timber harvesting was relatively constant over the period from 2001 to 2005: about 3.8 million tonnes of carbon or 0.06% of the total stock of biomass carbon in native forests was removed annually as roundwood.

Harvesting from managed native forests (that is, forests subject to harvest and regrowth from prior harvest) averaged around 11.8 million cubic metres of roundwood per year in the period from 2001 to 2005. About 3.8 million tonnes of carbon — equivalent to about 0.06% of the total carbon stored in native forests and 14.1 million tonnes of carbon dioxide — was removed.<sup>1[1]</sup> This small removal was exceeded by new growth: about 43.5 million tonnes of carbon dioxide (equivalent to 11.8 million tonnes of carbon) was estimated to have been sequestered in managed native forests in 2005 after taking into account the decay of slash produced during harvesting (see Table 82). Therefore annual sequestration was about three times annual removal by timber harvesting in 2005.

---

<sup>1[1]</sup> Roundwood removals include saw and veneer logs, sleepers, wood-based panels, paper and paperboard, fencing, mining timbers, poles and piles. The density of carbon in hardwood is assumed to be 0.325 t C/m<sup>3</sup>.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates February 2008

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

**Table 82 Sequestration and emissions in forests and agriculture, 2005**

	Mt CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent greenhouse gases <sup>a</sup>	Proportion of total national emissions (%)
<b>Native forests</b>		
Sequestration in managed native forests <sup>b</sup>	-43.5	
Biomass burning (prescribed fire and wildfire)	1.3	
Fuelwood used	10.4	
Net change in native forests	-31.9	
<b>Plantations<sup>c</sup></b>		
Plantations established post-1990 on cleared land	-21.9	
Plantations established pre-1990	2.3	
Net change in plantations	-19.6	
<b>Plantations plus managed native forests</b>	<b>-51.5</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Wood products</b>		
Storage in harvested wood products	-5.0	1
<b>Agriculture</b>	<b>87.9</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Deforestation (i.e. conversion to agriculture)</b>	<b>53.3</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Total national emissions (before deducting sinks)</b>	<b>583.3</b>	
<b>Net national emissions (after deducting sinks)</b>	<b>522.2</b>	

a A minus sign and green colour in this column means that greenhouse gases are removed from the atmosphere, while red indicates that greenhouse gases are emitted to the atmosphere.

b Forests subject to harvest and regrowth from prior harvest.

c Plantations established before 1990 are assumed to have been established by clearing native forests, even though a significant proportion were established on land that was already cleared. For plantations established after 1990, remote sensing data are used to distinguish the areas established on cleared sites from those established by clearing native forests.

Source: AGO (2007)

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 20

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Natural Gas Conversion at Devonport

**Hansard Page:** 135 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Abetz asked:**

**Senator ABETZ**—That is correct? Thank you very much. In relation to the natural gas conversion at Devonport, if I recall, are you able to say—if you do not know, take on notice—how much greenhouse gas emission—as I understand it, literally thousands of tonnes per annum—was being saved as a result of that conversion?

**Mr Bartlett**—I will have to take that on notice.

**Answer:**

In relation to the natural gas conversion project at Australian Paper's Wesley Vale pulp mill, it was indicated that the project will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 9 000 tonnes per annum.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 21

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Community Forest Agreement

**Hansard Page:** 135 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Abetz asked:**

**Senator ABETZ**—That is what I was talking about. That was a conversion that made the business more viable, but of course it had all the greenhouse benefits attached to it. I would have thought the Greens would celebrate. Moving on to the Community Forest Agreement and the amount of old growth forest put into reserves, are you able to—if you have the figures—remind us as to the exact number of hectares that were promised to be locked up as opposed to the actual number that were locked up? Is it not a factor that the actual number that were locked up was greater than the number promised?

**Mr Bartlett**—Certainly the answer to the last part of the question is: yes, it was greater. I did not bring the exact numbers with me, but I can provide them on notice.

**Answer:**

Under the Tasmanian Community Forest Agreement the Australian and Tasmanian governments agreed to reserving 121 200 hectares of old growth on public land and up to 25 000 hectares of old growth on private land.

Under their 2004 pre-election commitment, the Howard Government committed to 170 000 hectares of additional forest reserves in Tasmania.

Under the Tasmanian Community Forest Agreement the Australian and Tasmanian governments agreed to a total area of 181 050 hectares of additional forest reserves in Tasmania.



**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 22

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Gunns Pulp Mill

**Hansard Page:** 136 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Abetz asked:**

**Senator ABETZ**—Then the Greens, I think as a first, expressed some interest in how many jobs were in downstream processing or how many jobs were being exported. How many jobs do you know will be kept onshore as a result of the pulp mill being developed at Bell Bay? Are you able to give us a figure on that or not?

**Mr A. Grant**—It depends on whether you are asking about how many jobs will be created through that establishment or how many jobs will be, in your words, ‘kept on’. I am not quite sure of the context.

**Senator ABETZ**—All right, ‘created’. Thank you for correcting me. Do you have that figure?

**Mr A. Grant**—I do not have that figure.

**Senator ABETZ**—If you can try and take that on notice, that would be helpful.

**Answer:**

Gunns estimate that 1 250 jobs will be created during construction of the pulp mill and that the average number of new jobs, excluding those created during the construction phase of the mill, will be 1 620 during the first 30 years of the mill’s operation. These estimates are for direct jobs at the mill and do not include the creation of indirect jobs.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 23

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Departmental Legal Action

**Hansard Page:** 136- 137 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Abetz asked:**

**Senator ABETZ**—How much in costs has this department incurred in defending Senator Brown's personal court action?

**Mr A. Grant**—I would have to take that on notice.

**Senator McLucas**—I understand that it is not normal practice to enumerate costs in legal matters. I was in the legal and constitutional committee yesterday and we had that question, and that was the response from the department.

**Senator ABETZ**—Take it on notice, because I would imagine a fair degree of departmental resources may have been involved. Has the department incurred any cost in relation to that? Is the environment department or the Attorney-General's funding it? Do you know who?

**Senator McLucas**—We will take the question on notice.

**Answer:**

The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (the department) has an agreement with the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts for each department to pay 50 per cent of the costs. The total cost to-date has been \$730,659.21. The total costs incurred so far by the department are \$365,329.60.

The department has also incurred a cost of \$108 316.71 for department-specific legal advice on this matter.

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 24

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Rezoning of Moreton Bay Marine Park

**Hansard Page:** 137 (19/02/2008)

**Senator Boswell asked:**

**Senator BOSWELL**—Senator Abetz put in \$130,000 to study the impact of recreational and commercial fishing on the Queensland government's proposed rezoning of Moreton Bay, and I would like to know what the study shows and how it impacts on recreational and commercial fishermen in Moreton Bay.

**CHAIR**—Senator Boswell, I have been informed by the department that the first page of questions was to the wrong committee. Your other questions have been taken on notice.

**Answer:**

The study is complete and the final report for the FRDC funded project; *Regional impact assessment for the Moreton Bay Marine Park* is available for download from:

[www.vision6.com.au/download/files/08120/416631/FRDC+FINAL+REPORT.pdf](http://www.vision6.com.au/download/files/08120/416631/FRDC+FINAL+REPORT.pdf)

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2008

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** FF 25

**Division/Agency:** Fisheries and Forestry

**Topic:** Rezoning of Moreton Bay Marine Park

**Hansard Page:** written question

**Senator Boswell asked:**

In relation to the FRDC study on the impact of Moreton Bay rezoning, the federal government funded through FRDC a \$130,000 study to look at the impacts on recreational and commercial fishers of the Queensland government's proposed rezoning of the Moreton Bay Marine Park. Will the Department outline:

- a. Has the study been completed, and if not, when is it due for completion?
- b. What does the study show are the impacts on recreational fisherman in Moreton Bay?

**Answer:**

The study is complete and the final report for the FRDC funded project; *Regional impact assessment for the Moreton Bay Marine Park* is available for download from:

[www.vision6.com.au/download/files/08120/416631/FRDC+FINAL+REPORT.pdf](http://www.vision6.com.au/download/files/08120/416631/FRDC+FINAL+REPORT.pdf)